

[4th February 1925]

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ The answer given to this question is “ Excepting two cases where a small reward was given to persons who volunteered to accompany the troops, etc., the Government gave no grants of land or money to any such persons.” There is no reference made to those persons who volunteered their services. Is the hon. Member in a position to say who those persons were ? ”

The hon. Sir ARTHUR KNAPP :—“ They were private persons who accompanied the troops during the operations in connexion with the Mappilla rebellion.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ Can the hon. the Home Member give us some idea as to the amount of money which was given by way of rewards ? ”

The hon. Sir ARTHUR KNAPP :—“ I am afraid I must have notice of that question if I am to give the correct information.”

Acts.

Committee on the amendment of the Madras Estates Land Act I of 1908.

* 45 Q.—Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) at what stage the work of the Committee appointed to go into the question of amending the Madras Estates Land Act I of 1908 is ;

(b) who the members of that Committee are ;

(c) what interest each of the said members represents ;

(d) whether it is a fact that the landholders' interest is more strongly represented in that body ;

(e) who are the members in it who are expected to represent the tenants' interests ;

(f) how many meetings the committee held up to the date of answering this question ;

(g) what questions were decided in those meetings ; and

(h) when Government expect this Committee to finish its labours ?

A.—(a), (f), (g) & (h) The Committee has held two sittings till now. It cannot be said now when it will finish its labours.

(b) The hon. Member is referred to G.O. No. 1917, Law (General), dated the 27th June 1924, and G.O. No. 2441, Law (General), dated the 28th August 1924, both of which have been placed on the Editors' Table. At the instance of the Committee, the following Deputy Collectors have been co-opted as members :—

M.R.Ry. M. Narasimham Pantulu Garu.

M.R.Ry. N. Koil Pillai Avargal.

(c), (d) & (e) The hon. Member is referred to the answer given to question No. 367 asked at the meeting of the Council held in August 1924.

Recognition of Canon Law under the Madras Civil Courts Bill.

* 46 Q.—MR. J. A. SALDANHA: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to place before the Council the correspondence between the Madras Government and the Government of India on my amendment regarding the

4th February 1925]

observances and things of that kind, and the Government came to the conclusion that if they went into details of social observances and ostracism and topics of that kind, the procedure would, far from being of use to the community, exacerbate feelings. Therefore they have for the moment preferred that these communities should settle their disputes amicably. If, unfortunately, they cannot so settle the disputes, it may be necessary for the Government to step in, but it is hoped that there may be no need for the Government to step in."

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—" Though I do not want the hon. the Law Member to go into questions of social observances or ostracism and all that, I may tell him that the number of criminal cases as a result of this oppression has been increasing rapidly in the Tinnevely district. I have got a statement—and I can show it to the hon. the Law Member—of the number of cases that came to my notice, and it looks as if the social differences have not been settled amicably in spite of the pious wish of the hon. the Law Member. I would therefore request him to write to the Collector and other officers of the Tinnevely district and get their report as to whether these people are not oppressed and also showing what measures have been taken by these officers to protect this oppressed community."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" I shall communicate to the District Magistrate concerned the views expressed in this House by the hon. Member. But I am sure, Mr. President, if the matter is stated fully, it will at once demonstrate the difficulty in the matter. One community wants another community to take part in certain varieties of cremation work. This community, owing to the new consciousness of their legitimate rights or otherwise, declined to perform those services. And then the other communities, in return or retaliation, declined to give them certain elementary rights. In a matter of that kind, the functions of the Government must of necessity be very slight if they are to be assumed at all. Supposing, for instance, a number of people prevent the passage of some others through the streets, that is wrong, and Government can take action. But if social indignities are heaped upon them, what can the Government do ? "

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—" My information is that even the village officers are joining the other caste people to oppress the members of the Maruthuvakula community."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" The hon. Member will greatly assist Government if he will say in what manner the ill-treatment takes place, so as to enable the intervention of Government. If it is a mere social indignity, the hon. Member will, as readily as any other Member in this House, see the inherent impossibility of the Government intervening."

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—" The indignities are committed in a thousand and one subtle ways that it is not possible to point out that such and such a man is doing a particular thing. A number of village officers are joining the other caste people in heaping indignities upon this community. So if the hon. the Law Member would be kind enough to write to the chief authorities in the district, the Collector, the Superintendent of Police and others to see that the community is protected in the performance of their ordinary daily avocations, I shall be much obliged."

[4th February 1925]

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" All that I promise is that I shall undertake to convey to the authorities concerned the feelings exhibited by hon. Members in this House and the statements made by them."

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—" May I know whether any particular community has got a right over another community to compel them to do menial work unlawfully?" (Laughter).

Irrigation.

Improvement of the Suriliar channels.

* 50 Q.—Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) how far the proposals for improving the Suriliar channels have been worked out; and

(b) how far the spout system of irrigation recently introduced is progressing and whether it is really advantageous to the ryots?

A.—(a) Estimates have been prepared.

(b) Resluicing is in progress and, together with the remodelling of the channels of which this forms a part, should be very beneficial to the ryots.

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—" With regard to clause (a) of the question, may I know how long it would take to give effect to the proposals?"

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" As I have already stated in the answer to clause (b), resluicing is in progress, and I do not think it ought to take more than three or four months."

Repairs to the anicut, etc., at Periapalaiyam village, Erode taluk.

* 51 Q.—Mr. R. VEERIAN : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the anicut of Periapalaiyam village, Erode taluk, Coimbatore district, was washed away by the floods several years ago and the same was left in a ruined condition without any repairs whatever ever since the time;

(b) what has become of the mahazar submitted by the residents of Agrahara Periapalaiyam village, Erode taluk, to the Coimbatore District Collector on 20th March 1924 requesting him to inspect the channel and the anicut;

(c) whether it is a fact that owing to non-repairs of the channel and the anicut most of the lands lying near by were transferred from wet to dry except a few portions at the tail end of the channel;

(d) whether it is a fact that the signatories to the mahazar are prepared to dig the ruined channel at their expense on condition that the Government undertake to rebuild the existing anicut across Noyyal (under ruins);

(e) if so, the difficulty in accepting the offer made by the signatories to the mahazar; and